

NO OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In the Supreme Court of the United States

NEXBANK, SSB, et al.,

Petitioners,

V.

AMERICAN HOMEPATIENT, INC., et al., Respondents.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

James R. Kelley
Counsel of Record
Neal & Harwell, PLC
One Nashville Place
Suite 2000
150 4th Avenue North
Nashville, TN 37219
(615) 244-1713

Lenard M. Park.

Alan Wright
Henry Flores
Warren D. Dodson
Haynes and Boone, LLP
901 Main Street
Suite 3100
Dallas, TX 75202
(214) 651-5000

Counsel for Petitioners

QUESTION PRESENTED

The question presented is whether 11 U.S.C. § 502(g) preempts state law whenever state law would consider post-petition events in determining the contract damages arising from a bankruptcy trustee's or debtor-in-possession's rejection of an executory contract or unexpired lease.

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS BELOW

Petitioners are Aeres Finance-II Ltd.; Bank of America, N.A.; California Public Employees' Retirement System; Emerald Orchard Limited; General Electric Capital Corporation; Grand Central Asset Trust, HLD Series; Highland Crusader Offshore Partners, L.P.; Highland Floating Rate Advantage Fund; Highland Floating Rate Limited Liability Company; Jasper CLO Ltd.; Loan Funding IV; Loan Funding VII LLC; Morgan Stanley & Co. Inc.; NexBank, SSB; Pam Capital Funding L.P.; PamCo Cayman Ltd.; Restoration Funding CLO; and Southfork CLO, Ltd.

Respondents are AHP Finance, Inc.; AHP Alliance of Columbia; AHP Home Care Alliance of Gainesville; AHP Home Care Alliance of Tennessee: AHP Home Care Alliance of Virginia; AHP Home Medical Equipment Partnership of Texas; AHP Knoxville Partnership; AHP L.P.; Allegheny Respiratory Associates, Inc.; American HomePatient, Inc., a Delaware corporation; American HomePatient, Inc., a Tennessee corporation; American HomePatient of Arkansas, Inc.: American HomePatient of Illinois, Inc.; American HomePatient of Nevada, Inc.; American HomePatient of New York, Inc.; American HomePatient of Texas, L.P.; Colorado Home Medical Equipment Alliance, LLC; Designated Companies, Inc.: National I.V., Inc.: The National Medical Rentals, Inc.; National Medical Systems, Inc.; Northeast Pennsylvania Alliance, LLC; Northwest Washington Alliance, LLC: Sound Medical Equipment, Inc.; and Volunteer Medical Oxygen & Hospital Equipment Co.

RULE 29.6 STATEMENT

Petitioner Bank of America, N.A. is a subsidiary of Bank of America Corporation.

Petitioner General Electric Capital Corporation is a wholly owned subsidiary of General Electric Capital Services, Inc., which in turn is a subsidiary of General Electric Co. (99.81% ownership).

Petitioner Morgan Stanley & Co. Inc. is a wholly owned subsidiary of Morgan Stanley.

Aside from the subsidiary relationships described above, no corporation is a parent to any Petitioner-corporation, and no publicly held company owns 10% or more of any Petitioner-corporation's stock.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| QUESTION PRESENTED i |
|---|
| PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS BELOW ii |
| RULE 29.6 STATEMENT iii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS iv |
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES vi |
| PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI 1 |
| OPINIONS AND ORDER BELOW 1 |
| JURISDICTION 1 |
| RELEVANT STATUTORY PROVISIONS 1 |
| STATEMENT OF THE CASE 2 |
| A. Statutory Context |
| B. Factual Background 4 |
| C. Court of Appeals' Decision 7 |
| REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT 8 |
| I. REVIEW BY THIS COURT IS NECESSARY TO RESOLVE AN IMPORTANT QUESTION OF FEDERAL BANKRUPTCY LAW AND TO RESOLVE A CONFLICT BETWEEN THE COURTS OF APPEALS |

| A | question of federal bankruptcy law that this Court should resolve |
|--------|--|
| В | 3. The court of appeals' decision conflicts with a decision of the Fifth Circuit |
| C | C. The court of appeals' decision conflicts in principle with a decision of the First Circuit |
| | |
| | THE COURT OF APPEALS' DECISION WAS ERRONEOUS |
| A | The court of appeals' decision is erroneous in light of the history and purpose of 11 U.S.C. §§ 365(g)(1) and 502(g) |
| В | 3. The court of appeals' decision is otherwise erroneous |
| CONCL | USION |
| APPENI | DIX |
| | endix A - Sixth Circuit Order Denying Rehearing d 10/3/05 |
| Appe | endix B - Sixth Circuit Opinion Dated 7/11/05 . 3a |
| | endix C - District Court Memorandum Dated /04 |
| | endix D - Bankruptcy Court Memorandum Dated 2/03 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

| Addison v. Langston (In re Brints Cotton Marketing, Inc.), 737 F.2d 1338 (5th Cir. 1984) |
|--|
| Air Line Pilots Association, International v. Continental |
| Airlines, Inc. (In re Continental Airlines Corp.), |
| 901 F.2d 1259 (5th Cir. 1990) 15-16 |
| In re All For a Dollar, Inc., |
| 191 B.R. 262 (Bankr. D. Mass. 1996) |
| In re Bob's Sea Ray Boats, Inc., |
| 143 B.R. 229 (Bankr. N.D. 1992) |
| Butner v. United States, |
| 440 U.S. 48 (1979) |
| Central Trust Company of Illinois v. Chicago Auditorium |
| Association, |
| 240 U.S. 581 (1916) |
| Estate of Cowart v. Nicklos Drilling Co., |
| 505 U.S. 469 (1992) |
| In re Crown Books Corp., |
| 291 B.R. 623 (Bankr. D. Del. 2003) |
| In re Davies, |
| 27 B.R. 898 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. 1983) |
| |

| Energy Income Fund, L.P. v. Compression Solutions, Co., | , |
|---|----|
| L.L.C. (In re Magne Gas Co., L.L.C.), | |
| 255 B.R. 900 (E. W.D. Okla. 2000) | 11 |
| First Trust of New York, N.A. v. Joy Goodwin Trust | |
| (In re Ames Dep't Stores, Inc.), | |
| 209 B.R. 627 (S.D.N.Y. 1997) | 10 |
| In re Good Hope Chemical Corporation, | |
| 747 F.2d 806 (1st Cir. 1984) 16- | 18 |
| In re Greenville Auto Mall, Inc., | |
| 278 B.R. 414 (Bankr. N.D. Miss. 2001) | 11 |
| In re Handy Andy Home Improvement Centers, Inc., | |
| 1998 WL 603252 | |
| (Bankr. N.D. III. Sept. 11, 1998) | 11 |
| Hibbs v. Winn, | |
| 542 U.S. 88 (2004) | 22 |
| In re Iron-Oak Supply Corp., | |
| 169 B.R. 414 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 1994) | 11 |
| In re Kmart Corp., | |
| 2005 WL 3132460 | |
| (Bankr. N.D. III. Nov. 1, 2005) | 10 |
| Malden Mills Industries, Inc. v. Maroun | |
| (In re Malden Mills Industries, Inc.), | |
| 303 B.R. 688 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2004) | 25 |
| In ve Manchester Gas Storage, Inc., | |
| 309 B.R. 354 (Bankr. N.D. Okla. 2004) | 10 |

| In re Mirant Corp., | |
|--|-----|
| 332 B.R. 139 (Bankr. N.D. Tex. 2005) 1 | 0 |
| NLRB v. Bildisco & Bildisco, | |
| 465 U.S. 513 (1984) | 6 |
| Nobelman v. American Savings Bank, | |
| 508 U.S. 324 (1993) | 8 |
| In re O.P.M. Leasing Services, Inc., | |
| 56 B.R. 678 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1986) 2 | 5 |
| In re O.P.M. Leasing Services, Inc., | |
| 79 B.R. 161 (S.D.N.Y. 1987) | 5 |
| Olympic Airways v. Husain, | |
| 540 U.S. 644 (2004) | 2 |
| R & O Elevator Co., Inc. v. Harmon, | |
| 93 B.R. 667 (D. Minn. 1988) | 0 |
| Raleigh v. Illinois Department of Revenue, | |
| 530 U.S. 15 (2000) | 1 |
| Sexton v. Dreyfus, | |
| 219 U.S. 339 (1911) | 5 |
| Solow v. PPI Enterprises (U.S.), Inc. | |
| (In re PPI Enterprises (U.S.), Inc.), | |
| 324 F.3d 197 (3d Cir. 2003) | 1 |
| Sorrells v. United States, | 100 |
| 287 U.S. 435 (1932) | 4 |

| In re VanZandt, |
|---|
| 326 B.R. 737 (Bankr. S.D. Iowa 2004) 10 |
| Workman v. Harrison, 282 F.2d 693 (10th Cir. 1960) |
| Zavelo v. Reeves, 227 U.S. 625 (1913) |
| Statutes |
| 11 U.S.C. § 365(a) |
| 11 U.S.C. § 365(d)(2) |
| 11 U.S.C. § 365(g) |
| 11 U.S.C. § 365(g)(1) passin |
| 11 U.S.C. § 502(e)(2) |
| 11 U.S.C. § 502(f) |
| 11 U.S.C. § 502(g) passin |
| 11 U.S.C. § 502(g)(1) |
| 11 U.S.C. § 502(g)(2) |
| 11 U.S.C. § 502(h) |
| 11 U.S.C. § 502(i) |
| 11 U.S.C. § 507 |

| 11 U.S.C. § 562(a) |
|---|
| 11 U.S.C. § 741(7)(A) |
| 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) |
| Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1978, Pub. L. 95-598, 92 Stat. 2590 |
| Chandler Act, ch. 575, § 63c, 52 Stat. 840 (1938) 19 |
| N.Y. U.C.C. Law § 2-713 |
| Other Authorities |
| 4A RONALD A. ANDERSON, ANDERSON ON THE UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE §§ 2-708:2, 2-709:2, 2-710:2, 2-712:2, 2-713:2, 2-715:2 (3d ed. 1997) |
| Michael T. Andrew, Executory Contracts in Bankruptcy: Understanding 'Rejection', 59 U. Colo. L. Rev. 845 (1988) |
| Ralph Brubaker, Rejection of Executory Contracts and the Nondebtor Party's Resulting Breach Claim: Exploring the Limits of the Code's Fictional Prepetition Breach, 25 BANKR. L. LETTER, No. 12, Dec. 2005 4, 8, 18, 19, 21 |
| 11 ARTHUR LINTON CORBIN, CORBIN ON CONTRACTS § 1039 (interim ed. 1979) |
| Vern Countryman, The Use of State Law in Bankruptcy Cases (pt. 1), 47 N.Y.U. L. REV. 407 (1972) 8 |

| 3 MARY ANNE FORAN, WILLISTON ON SALES § 24-13 (4th ed. 1996) |
|--|
| LON L. FULLER, LEGAL FICTIONS (1967) |
| H. Rep. No. 95-595 (1977) |
| John F. Manning, The Absurdity Doctrine, 116 HARV. L. REV. 2387 (2003) |
| Definition of determine - Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, http://www.m-w.com/dictionary/determine 21-22 |
| Thomas E. Plank, <i>The Erie Doctrine and Bankruptcy</i> , 79 NOTRE DAME L. REV. 633 (2004) |
| 4 ALAN N. RESNICK ET AL., COLLIER ON BANKRUPTCY, 15TH EDITION REVISED ¶ 502.08[2][b] (2005) 9 |
| RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF CONTRACTS § 350(1) (1981) |
| S. Rep. No. 75-1916 (1938) |
| S. REP. No. 95-989 (1978) |
| U.Č.C. § 2-708 (2003) |
| U.C.C. § 2-709(b) (2003) |
| U.C.C. § 2-710 (2003) |
| U.C.C. § 2-712(2) (2003) |